

---

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

---

---

**EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

---

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

§

*versus*

§

CASE NO. 4:08-CR-22(4)

§

CORNEL GOLSTON

§

§

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Pending before the court is Defendant Cornel[*i*] Golston's ("Golston") Motion for Compassionate Release (#219), wherein Golston requests that the court modify his sentence and immediately release him from prison due to the threat of Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19"). United States Probation and Pretrial Services ("Probation") conducted an investigation and recommends that the court deny the motion. Having considered the motion, Probation's recommendation, and the applicable law, the court is of the opinion that the motion should be DENIED.

**I. Background**

On February 13, 2008, a federal grand jury in the Eastern District of Texas returned an Indictment charging Golston and 4 others in Count 1 with Conspiracy to Manufacture, Distribute or Possess with Intent to Manufacture, Distribute or Dispense Cocaine Base (Crack), in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846, and Aiding and Abetting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2. The Indictment also charged Golston in Count 11 with Possession with the Intent to Distribute Cocaine Base (Crack), in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), and Aiding and Abetting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2, and in Count 15 with Distribution or Manufacturing in or near a Playground, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 860 and 841(a). On May 21, 2008, Golston pleaded guilty to Count 1 of the Indictment without a plea agreement. On September 16, 2008, the court sentenced Golston to 178 months'

imprisonment, followed by a 3-year term of supervised release. He is currently housed at Federal Correctional Institution Seagoville located in Seagoville, Texas (“FCI Seagoville”). Golston’s projected release date is February 24, 2021.

## II. Analysis

On December 21, 2018, the President signed the First Step Act of 2018 into law. *See* First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, 132 Stat. 5194. The Act, in part, amended 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c), which gives the court discretion, in certain circumstances, to reduce a defendant’s term of imprisonment:

The court, upon motion of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”), or upon motion of the defendant after the defendant has fully exhausted all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the [BOP] to bring a motion on the defendant’s behalf or the lapse of 30 days from the receipt of such a request by the warden of the defendant’s facility, whichever is earlier, may reduce the term of imprisonment (and may impose a term of probation or supervised release with or without conditions that does not exceed the unserved portion of the original term of imprisonment), after considering the factors set forth in section 3553(a) to the extent that they are applicable, if it finds that extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant such a reduction; or the defendant is at least 70 years of age, has served at least 30 years in prison, pursuant to a sentence imposed under section 3559(c), for the offense or offenses for which the defendant is currently imprisoned, and a determination has been made by the Director of the [BOP] that the defendant is not a danger to the safety of any other person or the community, as provided under section 3142(g); and that such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission . . . .

18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). This provision is commonly referred to as “compassionate release.”

Prior to the First Step Act, only the Director of the BOP could file a motion seeking compassionate release. *See Tuozzo v. Shartle*, No. 13-4897, 2014 WL 806450, at \*2 (D.N.J. Feb. 27, 2014) (denying petitioner’s motion for compassionate release because no motion for his release was filed by the BOP); *Slate v. United States*, No. 5:09-CV-00064, 2009 WL 1073640, at \*3 (S.D.W.Va. Apr. 21, 2009) (“Absent a motion from the BOP, the Court lacks authority to grant

compassionate release.”). The First Step Act amended § 3582(c) by providing a defendant the means to appeal the BOP’s decision not to file a motion for compassionate release on the defendant’s behalf. *United States v. Cantu*, 423 F. Supp. 3d 345, 347 (S.D. Tex. 2019); *United States v. Bell*, No. 3:93-CR-302-M, 2019 WL 1531859, at \*1 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 9, 2019). The plain language of the statute, however, makes it clear that the court may not grant a defendant’s motion for compassionate release unless the defendant has complied with the administrative exhaustion requirement. 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A); *United States v. Alam*, 960 F.3d 831, 833 (6th Cir. 2020) (“Even though [the] exhaustion requirement does not implicate [the court’s] subject-matter jurisdiction, it remains a mandatory condition.”); *United States v. Raia*, 954 F.3d 594, 597 (3d Cir. 2020) (“[T]he exhaustion requirement . . . presents a glaring roadblock foreclosing compassionate release.”). Thus, before seeking relief from the court, a defendant must first submit a request to the warden of his facility to move for compassionate release on his behalf and then either exhaust his administrative remedies or wait for the lapse of 30 days after the warden received the request. 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A); *United States v. Harris*, No. 20-1723, 2020 WL 4048690, at \*1 (3d Cir. July 20, 2020); *United States v. Springer*, No. 20-5000, 2020 WL 3989451, at \*3 (10th Cir. July 15, 2020) (defendant “was required to request that the BOP file a compassionate-release motion on his behalf to initiate his administrative remedies” (citing *Raia*, 954 F.3d at 595)); *Alam*, 960 F.3d at 833-34; *United States v. Soliz*, No. 2:16-190-3, 2020 WL 2500127, at \*3 (S.D. Tex. May 14, 2020) (“§ 3582(c)(1)(A) does not provide this Court with the equitable authority to excuse [defendant’s] failure to exhaust his administrative remedies or to waive the 30-day waiting period.” (quoting *United States v. Reeves*, No. 18-00294, 2020 WL 1816496, at \*2 (W.D. La. Apr. 9, 2020))).

In his motion, Golston makes no mention and gives no indication that he has contacted the warden regarding his request for compassionate release. Probation reported in its response dated August 10, 2020, “A unit manager at FCI Seagoville stated that Mr. Golston has not submitted a request for compassionate release or a reduction of his sentence to the Warden. As such, it does not appear that Mr. Golston has exhausted all administrative remedies for relief consideration required by statute.” Golston is foreclosed from obtaining relief if he has not submitted a request for compassionate release based on the circumstances raised in the instant motion to the warden of the facility where he is housed. The court is without authority to waive the exhaustion of administrative remedies or the 30-day waiting period. *See Alam*, 960 F.3d at 832 (“[B]ecause this exhaustion requirement serves valuable purposes (there is no other way to ensure an orderly processing of applications for early release) and because it is mandatory (there is no exception for some compassionate-release requests over others), we must enforce it.”); *United States v. Garcia*, No. CR 2:18-1337, 2020 WL 3000528, at \*3 (S.D. Tex. June 2, 2020) (“While the Court sympathizes with Defendant’s plight, because he has failed to comply with the exhaustion requirements under § 3582, his motion is not ripe for review, and the Court is without jurisdiction to grant it.”); *United States v. Garcia-Mora*, No. CR 18-00290-01, 2020 WL 2404912, at \*2 (W.D. La. May 12, 2020) (“Section 3582(c)(1)(A) does not provide [the court] with the equitable authority to excuse [the defendant’s] failure to exhaust his administrative remedies or to waive the 30-day waiting period.”); *United States v. Collins*, No. CR 04-50170-04, 2020 WL 1929844, at \*2 (W.D. La. Apr. 20, 2020); *see also Ross v. Blake*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 136 S. Ct. 1850, 1857 (2016) (“[J]udge-made exhaustion doctrines . . . remain amenable to judge-made exceptions,” whereas “mandatory exhaustion statutes . . . establish mandatory exhaustion regimes, foreclosing

judicial discretion.”). Accordingly, at this time, without evidence that Golston has exhausted his administrative remedies, the court does not have the authority to grant the relief Golston requests. Moreover, even if he did comply with the exhaustion requirement before filing the present motion, nothing in his motion indicates that extraordinary and compelling reasons exist to reduce his sentence and release him from confinement.

Congress did not define “extraordinary and compelling.” Rather, it elected to delegate its authority to the United States Sentencing Commission (“the Commission”). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 994(t) (“The Commission, in promulgating general policy statements regarding the sentencing modification provisions in section 3582(c)(1)(A) of title 18, shall describe what should be considered extraordinary and compelling reasons for sentence reduction, including the criteria to be applied and a list of specific examples.”); *see also* U.S. SENTENCING GUIDELINES MANUAL § 1B1.13 (U.S. SENTENCING COMM’N 2018) (“USSG”). In Application Note 1 to § 1B1.13 of the USSG, the Commission defined “extraordinary and compelling reasons” to include the following four categories of circumstances: (i) certain medical conditions of the defendant; (ii) the defendant is 65 years or older and meets other requirements; (iii) the defendant’s family has specified needs for a caregiver; and (iv) other reasons in the defendant’s case that establish an extraordinary and compelling reason. The court must also consider the factors set forth in 18

U.S.C. § 3553(a),<sup>1</sup> as applicable, and find that the sentence modification is consistent with the policy statements issued by the Commission. 18 U.S.C § 3582(c)(1)(A). The policy statement regarding compassionate release requires a determination that “the defendant is not a danger to the safety of any other person or to the community.” U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13(2).

As grounds for relief, Golston claims: “I have been dealing with asthma my whole life.” He also states that he “tested positive for corona-virus.” The USSG provides that extraordinary and compelling reasons exist regarding a defendant’s medical condition when the defendant is “suffering from a terminal illness (*i.e.*, a serious and advanced illness with an end of life trajectory)” or when a defendant is “suffering from a serious physical or medical condition,” “suffering from a serious functional or cognitive impairment,” or “experiencing deteriorating physical or mental health because of the aging process, that substantially diminishes the ability of the defendant to provide self-care within the environment of a correctional facility and from which he or she is not expected to recover.” U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13 cmt. n.1(A).

Although Golston, age 40, asserts that he has suffered from asthma throughout his life, he provides no details or documentation in support of this claim. A review of Golston’s Presentence Investigation Report (“PSR”), prepared on June 23, 2008, reveals that he made no mention to Probation of suffering from asthma or any medical condition at that time. Instead, according to

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 3553(a) directs courts to consider: the nature and circumstances of the offense and the defendant’s history and characteristics; the need to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense; the need to deter criminal conduct; the need to protect the public; the need to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner; the kinds of sentences and sentencing ranges established for defendants with similar characteristics under applicable USSG provisions and policy statements; any pertinent policy statement of the Commission in effect on the date of sentencing; the need to avoid unwarranted disparities among similar defendants; and the need to provide restitution to the victim. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

the PSR, “he reported he is healthy and has no history of any health problems.” Probation’s report dated August 10, 2020, confirms that Golston remains in good health: “The BOP reports that Mr. Golston is a Care Level 1 inmate with no medical conditions. He is not receiving any medical treatment and is considered ambulatory. While Mr. Golston states in the instant motion having asthma, the BOP medical unit is not reporting any medical conditions.” Probation adds, “With respect to his health, Mr. Golston does not have any medical problems according to the BOP staff that would make him a medically high risk inmate for COVID-19 complications.” In fact, according to Probation, “Mr. Golston is currently housed in isolation and was said to have recovered from COVID-19 infection on July 28, 2020.” In light of the conflicting information, the court questions the reliability of Golston’s reporting about suffering from asthma. In any event, this condition did not prevent or impair him from engaging in a series of crimes from age 18 until his most recent arrest in 2008. Thus, Golston’s medical summary does not meet the criteria listed in the guidelines. His reported medical condition is not terminal, nor does it substantially diminish his ability to provide self-care. Hence, Golston has failed to establish that a qualifying medical condition exists that would constitute extraordinary and compelling reasons to reduce his sentence. Even if Golston had provided evidence that he was suffering from such a medical condition, “compassionate release is discretionary, not mandatory, and [may] be refused after weighing the sentencing factors of 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).” *United States v. Chambliss*, 948 F.3d 691, 693 (5th Cir. 2020). Where, as here, the defendant has an extensive criminal history, the district court has discretion to deny compassionate release after weighing the evidence. *Id.* at 693-94.

Golston's request for compassionate release potentially falls into the fourth, catch-all category of "other" extraordinary and compelling reasons, which specifically states that the Director of the BOP shall determine whether "there exists in the defendant's case an extraordinary and compelling reason other than, or in combination with, the reasons described in subdivisions (A) through (C)." *Id.* § 1B1.13 cmt. n.1(D). Although Subdivision D is reserved to the BOP Director, the Commission acknowledged, even before the passage of the First Step Act, that courts are in the position to determine whether extraordinary and compelling circumstances are present. *United States v. Beck*, 425 F. Supp. 3d 573, 583 (M.D.N.C. 2019) ("Read in light of the First Step Act, it is consistent with the previous policy statement and with the Commission guidance more generally for courts to exercise similar discretion as that previously reserved to the BOP Director in evaluating motions by defendants for compassionate release."); *see Cantu*, 423 F. Supp. 3d at 352 ("[T]he correct interpretation of § 3582(c)(1)(A) . . . is that when a defendant brings a motion for a sentence reduction under the amended provision, the Court can determine whether any extraordinary and compelling reasons other than those delineated in U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13 cmt. n.1(A)-(C) warrant granting relief.").

In the case at bar, there is no indication that the BOP Director made a determination regarding the presence of extraordinary and compelling reasons with respect to Golston for any "other" reason. In exercising its discretion, the court also finds that no extraordinary and compelling reasons exist in relation to Golston's situation. Although Golston reports testing positive for COVID-19 in his motion filed August 3, 2020, Probation reports that he was isolated and recovered from the disease on July 28, 2020. As of August 16, 2020, the figures available at [www.bop.gov](http://www.bop.gov) list 35 inmates and 4 staff members at FCI Seagoville as currently positive for

COVID-19. The figures also indicate that 1,314 inmates and 24 staff members have recovered, while 3 inmates succumbed to the disease. Therefore, although Golston expresses legitimate concerns regarding COVID-19, he does not establish that the BOP cannot manage the outbreak within his correctional facility or that the facility is specifically unable to treat him, if he were to contract the virus and develop COVID-19 symptoms, while incarcerated; to the contrary, it appears that he already contracted the disease and the BOP responded appropriately, ensuring that he received the necessary medical treatment to survive and recover from the disease. *See Raia*, 954 F.3d at 597 (“[T]he mere existence of COVID-19 in society and the possibility that it may spread to a particular prison alone cannot independently justify compassionate release, especially considering BOP’s statutory role, and its extensive and professional efforts to curtail the virus’s spread.”); *United States v. Vasquez*, No. CR 2:18-1282-S-1, 2020 WL 3000709, at \*3 (S.D. Tex. June 2, 2020) (“General concerns about the spread of COVID-19 or the mere fear of contracting an illness in prison are insufficient grounds to establish the extraordinary and compelling reasons necessary to reduce a sentence.” (quoting *United States v. Koons*, No. 16-214-05, 2020 WL 1940570, at \*5 (W.D. La. Apr. 21, 2020))); *United States v. Clark*, No. CR 17-85-SDD-RLB, 2020 WL 1557397, at \*5 (M.D. La. Apr. 1, 2020) (finding the defendant had failed to present extraordinary and compelling reasons to modify his prison sentence because he “does not meet any of the criteria set forth by the statute” and he “cites no authority for the proposition that the fear of contracting a communicable disease warrants a sentence modification”). Furthermore, contracting the virus while incarcerated, even in conjunction with preexisting health conditions, is insufficient to establish exceptional and compelling circumstances warranting compassionate release. *See United States v. Jackson*, No. 3:16-CR-196-L-1, 2020 WL 4365633, at \*2 (N.D.

Tex. July 30, 2020) (finding that defendant had failed to present extraordinary and compelling reasons for compassionate release despite suffering from previous underlying health conditions and testing positive for COVID-19). Thus, Golston has failed to establish that a qualifying medical condition or other reasons exist that would constitute extraordinary and compelling reasons to release him from prison.

The court further finds that compassionate release is not warranted in light of the applicable factors set forth in § 3553(a). *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) (requiring courts to consider the § 3553(a) factors before granting compassionate release); *Chambliss*, 948 F.3d at 693-94. The nature and circumstances of Golston's offense of conviction entails his participating in a conspiracy to distribute 50 grams or more of crack cocaine and that he distributed it within 1,000 feet of a playground. A search of his residence yielded cocaine base, Xanax pills, digital scales, and currency.

Golston is classified as a career offender and has an extensive criminal history dating back to 1997, including prior convictions for possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver, unlawfully carrying a weapon, evading arrest or detention (2), possession of marijuana, possession with intent to deliver cocaine, delivery of a controlled substance in a drug free zone, and assault causing bodily injury - family member. According to the PSR, his assault conviction stems from his hitting his girlfriend on the top of the head and in the abdominal area while she was pregnant with his child. Golston failed to comply with a previous term of probation, was on parole at the time of the offense of conviction, and also has a history of poly-substance abuse. Probation reports that, with respect to his custody level, the BOP classifies Golston as a high-risk inmate.

Under the circumstances, the court cannot conclude that Golston would not pose a danger to the safety of any other person or to the community, if released from confinement.

Moreover, the BOP has instituted a comprehensive management approach that includes screening, testing, appropriate treatment, prevention, education, and infection control measures in response to COVID-19. In response to a directive from the United States Attorney General in March 2020, the BOP immediately began reviewing all inmates who have COVID-19 risk factors, as described by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, for the purpose of determining which inmates are suitable for placement on home confinement. *See Collins*, 2020 WL 1929844, at \*3. The BOP notes that inmates need not apply to be considered for home confinement, as this is being done automatically by case management staff. To date, the BOP has placed 7,477 inmates on home confinement. The March 2020 directive is limited to “eligible at-risk inmates who are non-violent and pose minimal likelihood of recidivism and who might be safer serving their sentences in home confinement rather than in BOP facilities.” *United States v. Castillo*, No. CR 2:13-852-1, 2020 WL 3000799, at \*3 (S.D. Tex. June 2, 2020). The BOP has the exclusive authority to determine where a prisoner is housed; thus, the court is without the authority to order home confinement. 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b); *Castillo*, 2020 WL 3000799, at \*3; *see United States v. Miller*, No. 2:17-CR-015-D (02), 2020 WL 2514887, at \*1 (N.D. Tex. May 15, 2020) (“[N]either the CARES Act nor the First Step Act authorizes the court to release an inmate to home confinement.”).

In his Memorandum to the BOP dated March 26, 2020, Attorney General Barr acknowledges that the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) has an obligation to protect both BOP personnel and inmates. He also notes that the DOJ has the responsibility of protecting the public,

meaning that “we cannot take any risk of transferring inmates to home confinement that will contribute to the spread of COVID-19 or put the public at risk in other ways.” The Attorney General issued a subsequent Memorandum to the BOP on April 3, 2020, in which he emphasizes that police officers protecting the public face an increased risk from COVID-19 and cannot avoid exposure to the virus, with their numbers dwindling as officers who contract the virus become ill or die or need to recover or quarantine to avoid spreading the disease. Accordingly, he cautions:

The last thing our massively over-burdened police forces need right now is the indiscriminate release of thousands of prisoners onto the streets without any verification that those prisoners will follow the laws when they are released, that they have a safe place to go where they will not be mingling with their old criminal associates, and that they will not return to their old ways as soon as they walk through the prison gates.

As the court noted in *United States v. Preston*, “[t]he best predictor of how [Defendant] will behave if he were to be released is how he behaved in the past, and his track record is a poor one.” No. 3:18-CR-307-K, 2020 WL 1819888, at \*4 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 11, 2020) (quoting *United States v. Martin*, No. PWG-19-140-13, 2020 WL 1274857, at \*3 (D. Md. Mar. 17, 2020)). Here, Golston’s track record is similarly a poor one.

In short, Golston has failed to satisfy his burden of showing the necessary circumstances to warrant relief under the statutory framework to which the court must adhere. See *United States v. Dodge*, No. 17-323-01, 2020 WL 3668765, at \*5 (W.D. La. July 6, 2020) (stressing that “the rampant spread of the coronavirus and the conditions of confinement in jail, alone, are not sufficient grounds to justify a finding of extraordinary and compelling circumstances”); *Koons*, 2020 WL 1940570, at \*4-5 (same). As the court observed in *Koons*, rejecting the notion that it has “carte blanche” authority to release whomever it chooses, “[t]he Court cannot release every

prisoner at risk of contracting COVID-19 because the Court would then be obligated to release every prisoner.” *Dodge*, 2020 WL 3668765, at \*6; *Koons*, 2020 WL 1940570, at \*5.

III. Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing analysis, Golston’s Motion for Compassionate Release (#219) is DENIED.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 17th day of August, 2020.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Marcia A. Crone". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. Below the signature is a horizontal line.

MARCIA A. CRONE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE